

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-30 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 6, 8-12, 14, 15, 17-19, 21, and 23-26 are amended and Claim 31 is canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, by the present amendment. The amendments to Claims 1, 6, 8-12, 14, 15, 17-19, 21, and 23-26 address informalities or objections and antecedent basis issues identified in the outstanding Office Action, as discussed below. Other changes to the claims are supported in the originally-filed disclosure at least by the originally-filed claims and at paragraphs [0143], [0336], [0337], and [0318]. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the drawings were objected to with regard to Claims 8 and 24; Claims 1-30 were objected to; and Claims 1-8, 10, 17, 18, 21, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The “synchronization mechanism” recited in Claim 8 is depicted as A805 at Fig. 47. The “multi-channel multiplexing mechanism” has been amended to more clearly recite a “multi-channel identifying mechanism” in Claim 24, and that feature is depicted at Fig. 50 as D140. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

With regard to the objections listed at pages 3 and 4 of the outstanding Office Action, Applicants have amended the claims to address the objections with the exceptions discussed herein. In Claim 9, “a duty cycle of less than 0.1%” is supported by originally-filed Claim 9 and is not inconsistent with the specification which describes a duty cycle of less than 1%. In Claim 10, “an encoded data stream of symbols” is correct because what is recited at line 15 is “an encoded and modulated second original data stream.” Applicants respectfully request

that the objections to Claims 1-30 be withdrawn in light of the amendments and the above discussion.

Turning now to the rejection of Claims 1-8, 10, 17, 18, 21, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Applicants and Applicants' representative thank Examiner Tse for clarifying the rejection in a telephone discussion. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been traversed with amendments to the claims as needed based on the discussion. As discussed with Examiner Tse, T, N, and B are, in fact, defined in the claims as a time duration, a number of nodes, and a number of base stations, respectively. Claims 1, 17, and 21 are amended with respect to the symbols M, P, and λ , listed at page 4 of the outstanding Office Action. The antecedent basis issues in Claims 6, 18, and 25 have also been addressed. Finally, Claim 8 has been amended to depend from Claim 7, and Claims 21 and 26 have been amended to recite limitations consistent with an apparatus. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-8, 10, 17, 18, 21, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Usha Munukutla-Parker
Registration No. 61,939

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/07)